



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,734	10/25/2000	Daniel H Craft	07844-461001	4542

21876 7590 03/27/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
500 ARGUELLO STREET
SUITE 500
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/697,734

Applicant(s)

CRAFT, DANIEL H

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "location can defined in terms" appears to contain a grammatical error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the selected location" in line 6 and line 8 of page 8 as well as "the input" in line 5 of page 8.

Claim 5 recites the limitations "the input" in line 21 of page 8, "the selected location" in line 22 and line 23-24 of page 8 as well as "the reference mark" in line 23 of page 8 as well.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the selected location" in line 10 of page 9 and "the highlighting" in line 11 of page 9.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the selected location" in line 13 of page 9, "the time" in line 13 of page 9, "the highlighting" in line 14 and line 15 of page 9 as well as "the reference mark" in line 14 of page 9.

There are insufficient antecedent basis for the limitations in these claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Winsky et al. ("Winsky", US 5,774,109) in view of Blumenthal (US 6,026,409).

As per claim 1, Winsky teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device, comprising receiving a user input selecting a location in a document displayed in a display pane and requesting a show-me operation and, in response to the input, displaying a visual reference mark indicating the location in the pane (col. 4, lines 8-9 and lines 19-21; col. 5, lines 7-16) then smoothly scrolling the document and the reference mark in the pane until the selected location is at a target location in the pane (col. 5, lines 51-53). Winsky does not explicitly disclose removing the visual reference mark. Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device, comprising receiving a user input and, in response to the input, displaying a visual reference mark indicating the location in the pane and then removing the visual reference mark (col. 13, lines 17-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Blumenthal's teaching of removing a visual reference mark after a selected location is at a target location in a document display to Winsky's teaching of visual reference marks and scrolling until the selected location is

at a target location in a document display in order to allow users to input a new selection without cluttering the display area with visual reference marks from the previous selection.

As per claim 2, Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device wherein the user input selects a location corresponding to a line of text (col. 19, lines 39-41).

As per claim 3, Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device, wherein the user input selects a location corresponding to a graphic object (col. 21, lines 66-67; col. 22, lines 21-24).

As per claim 4, Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device wherein the user input selects a location corresponding to a video object (col. 22, lines 6-15).

Claim 5 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 6, the modified teachings of Winksy and Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device comprising instructions to receive a user input pointing to a text location of text in the document (Blumenthal; col. 19, lines 39-41), draw the reference mark as a reference line perpendicular to a scrolling direction and intersecting the text location (Blumenthal; fig. 2; col. 10, lines 44-46) and smoothly scroll the document and the reference line to the target location (Winksy; col. 5, lines 51-53), the target location being close to a start edge of the pane (Blumenthal, col. 10, lines 49-50; col. 19, lines 59-65).

As per claim 7, Winsky teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device comprising instructions wherein the target location is within two text lines of the start edge of the pane (fig. 7A).

As per claim 8, Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device comprising instructions to highlight a line of text at the location at a time the location is selected, highlight being the reference mark (col. 4, lines 36-37).

As per claim 9, Blumenthal teaches a computer-implemented method of displaying a document on a display device comprising instructions to highlight a line of text at the location at a time the location is selected, the highlight being supplemental to the reference mark (col. 15, lines 21-25) and remove the highlight no later than when the reference mark is removed (col. 13, lines 17-62).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Borden et al. (US 6,268,854 B1) teach a picture search device and recording medium readable for the same.

Gould (US 6,335,730) teaches a computer user interface with non-salience de-emphases.

Tsubaki et al. (US 5,815,138) teach a method and apparatus for controlling a cursor.

Lemelson et al. (US 6,421,064 B1) teach system and methods for controlling automatic scrolling of information on a display screen.

Shwartz et al. (US 5,802,516) teach a method of controlling an electronic book for a computer system.

Inquires

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-7601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 746-7239 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen
Patent Examiner
March 17, 2003

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100